

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/600,571 06/23/2003		6/23/2003	Masao Hori	HARA-072-046	9645	
20374	7590	12/05/2006		EXAMINER		
KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK SUITE 710				NGUYEN, TU MINH		
900 17TH STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				3748	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_	

## Advisory Action Refere the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)
	10/600,571	HORI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tu M. Nguyen	3748

Before the Filling of an Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
·	Tu M. Nguyen	3748	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or of TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	. ,	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offite of the final rejection, e	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	is of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a			ine issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected in pre-		l be entered and an e	<del>xplanation of</del>
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 11-16</u> .		;	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		:	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ied.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowar	ice because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
13. Other:		TU M. N 12/4/2	Jaugen
		12/4/2	006

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding to the "As to exhaust gas" argument, the claim in the pending application that the invention is directed to a fuel-direct-injection gasoline engine has been determined as an "intended use statement". The examiner has noted that most internal combustion engines (which includes the engine in the pending application and lean burning engine in Katoh et al.) that utilize HC as a fuel generate exhaust gases containing harmful emissions of HC, NOx, soot, CO, and SOx, that require purification before the gases can be released to the atmosphere; and the mere selection of the purification process of Katoh et al. for use in a gasoline fuel-direct-injection engine would be well within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding to the "As to catalyst" argument, similar to the pending application, the catalyst (6) in Katoh et al. also include a noble metal (platinum, line 65 of column 3) and a fire-resistant inorganic oxide (active alumina, line 62 of column 3) carrying the noble metal. This catalyst is also adapted to purify NOx, CO, and HC contained in the exhaust gas under a stoichiometric condition (see Figure 3B).

Regarding to the "As to controlling of temperature at an inlet of the catalyst" argument, the reference of Katoh et al. has been shown to control exhaust gas conditions (temperature and air-fuel ratio) at an inlet of the catalyst to purify an exhaust gas. As shown in Figure 5, when the exhaust gas is between 350 to 800 degree Celsius (step 106 with Yes answer), the exhaust gas is switched (in step 108) to a stoichiometric air-fuel ratio to reduce NOx released from the catalyst (see Figure 3B). When the gas is between 200 to 350 degree Celsius (step 106 with No answer), the gas is maintained (in step 110) at a lean normal condtion so that NOx in the gas can be adsorbed by the catalyst (see Figure 3A).